

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and continued examination of this application in view of the amendment and the following remarks. Claims 1-39 and 41 are pending in this application.

1. Status of the Claims

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 1-31 and 36 is noted with thanks and appreciation. Claims 32-35, 37-39 and 41 have been rejected. Claim 36 drawn to a bridge was objected to.

2. Rejection of Claims 32-35

The Examiner rejected claims 32-35 under § 102 for being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,702,337 to Rutter et al. ("Rutter"). Independent claim 32 has been amended to recite that the dispensing member, "for which the larger open section of the aperture has to be sized and shaped to accommodate passage through," has to be "integral to a bag-in-box container." Rutter does not disclose, teach or suggest both a dispensing member "integral to a bag-in-box container" and a bridge. Therefore, Rutter does not anticipate or render obvious claim 32. Thus, claim 32 and claims 33-35, which depend upon claim 32, are patentable.

In addition, claim 35 is independently patentable because it claims a bridge "adapted to span the top of the bag-in-box container." The Examiner contends that spout 105 of Rutter is a bridge. However Rutter does not disclose, teach or suggest that spout 105 span the top of the bag in box container. Spout 105 of Rutter merely sits on the top of the bag-in-box container. Thus, claim 35 is independently patentable of claim 32.

3. Objection to Claim 36

Claim 36 was objected to as being dependent on claim 32. Because claim 32 is patentable, Applicants submit that the objection should be withdrawn.

4. Rejection of Claims 37-39 and 41

Claims 37 and 38 were rejected under § 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,609,195 to Stricklin et al. ("Stricklin"). Claims 37-40 were rejected under § 102 for being anticipated by Rutter. Claim 41 was rejected under § 103 as being rendered obvious by Stricklin.

Independent claim 37 was amended to include the limitation of:

a rotatable collar adapted on its inside to be secured to a component of the filler system, and
a ridge protruding circumferentially outward therefrom, said ridge being adapted to engage with and secure to a support bridge of the filler system.

In other words, the adapter of claim 37 can be secured both by its inside "to a component of the filler system" and on its outside by a ridge to a "support bridge." The Examiner has admitted by implication that Stricklin does not disclose, teach or suggest the ridge because the Examiner did not reject claim 40, now cancelled, for being anticipated or rendered obvious by Stricklin.

Rutter discloses a ridge 219 extending inwardly, i.e. an internal adaptation for securing, but it does not disclose, teach, or suggest a ridge protruding circumferentially outward in addition to an internal adaptation. Moreover, Rutter does not disclose, teach, or suggest any external adaptation for securing purposes in addition to the internal ridge. Thus, claim 37, and claims 38, 39 and 41, which depend upon claim 37, are patentable.

5. Drawing Objection

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drawings did not show the "cam lock" recited in claim 39. Claim 39 has been amended to recite: "The adapter as defined by claim 38, wherein said upper end portion of the adapter has a cam lock connector." A male cam lock connector 14 is shown in Figure 2. The specification has also been amended by changing references to "cam lock" with "cam lock connector." Applicants submit that the objection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, all of the rejections have been overcome and claims 1-39 and 41 are allowable. An early indication of allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

James D. Ryndak
Registration No. 28,754
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: 3/10/05

RYNDAK & SURI
30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 2630
Chicago, IL 60602
312-214-7770 (telephone)
312-214-7715 (facsimile)